

Serial No. 09/938,496

Docket No.: 1614.1181

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. No new matter is presented and thus approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 are pending and under consideration.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5, 7-13, AND 15-16 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER MIYAKE ET AL. IN VIEW OF MATSUYAMA (U.S. PATENT 6,269,419)

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Data held in Matsuyama is for processing an interrupt request - - and is not data for continuing an instruction that is interrupted.

In the present invention, since data for continuing an interrupted instruction (for example, data on an execution status of the instruction) is held, the interrupted instruction can be continued. However, in Matsuyama, since such data is not held, the interrupted instruction cannot be continued.

Inasmuch as the Action concedes that Miyake fails to disclose a data holding part holding data which indicates a factor of an interrupt, it is clear that Matsuyama fails to supplement the deficient teaching of Miyake and, hence, the combination, even if appropriate, still fails to render obvious the invention of the independent claims herein.

Applicants further submit that *prima facie* obviousness of the combination has not been shown, consistent with the stringent requirements for same under MPEP 2143-2143.03. In the present instance, the Examiner makes the bare contention that, simply, "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art...to incorporate Matsuyama's teaching into Miyake system..." which is rejected out-of-hand as inadequate by the MPEP. Moreover, the Examiner's contention of why this combination would have been obvious - - i.e., "so as to provide an information processing method and an information processing apparatus capable of improving an interrupt response characteristic with respect to an interrupt factor of a high priority order..." bears no correlation to the invention as claimed nor even to the disclosure of Matsuyama.

Serial No. 09/938,496

Docket No.: 1614.1181

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references of record, taken singularly or in any proper combination and, there being no other objections or rejections, that the application is in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 14, 2005By: 

H. J. Staas

Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 2-17, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Date: 2-17-05